Jul 26 04 01:30p

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

- 1. The specification has been amended to include identification of reference number "53" which was indeed omitted in the application as filed as noted in the Office Action.
- 2. The Office Action required an election of one species from among six, each species corresponding to a figure. The applicant makes an election of species III - Fig.3. The applicant believes that the claims as amended which read on this species are claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, and 25.
- 3. The applicant does not believe that species I Fig. 1 is a distinct species from species II - Fig. 2. The differences in surface roughening (cross hatching versus dimples) do not effect the functionality of the invention, and the degree of flaring was not intended to show a functional difference.
- 4. The applicant argues that claim 1 is a generic claim with respect to species II, III, IV, and V that, as amended, are written in dependent form from claim 1.

<u>Species</u>	Claims that read on species
II	1,2,3,5,6,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,17,22,23,24,25
Ш	1,3,5,6,8,10,13,16,17,22,23,24,25
IV	1,4,6,7,8,10,13,16,17,22,23,24,25
V	1, 3, 5,6,8,10,13,16,17,18,22,23,24,25
VI	19,20 and 21

Applicant respectfully requests examination of species II, IV, and V in addition to the elected species III if a generic claim is allowable. Applicant also requests examination of species VI if it could be done without extensive additional effort by the examiner.

- 5. The applicant has amended the claims to make species II, IV, and V read clearly as dependent clauses, and to repair typos in claim 19.
- 6. Applicant wishes to point out that an IDS was submitted on June 9, 2004 which is not included in the IFW. A copy is enclosed for the examiner's convenience.

If there are any questions please contact the undersigned attorney at (510)785-8070 or facsimile (510)372-2778.

Respectfully Submitted,

Howard E Lebourts

Jul 26 04 01:31p

Howard E. Lebowitz Registration No. 44,864

Attorney of Record